REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1 – 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicant regards as the invention.

Response

The claims have been carefully revised to correct for the lack of antecedent basis for terms, and to correct grammatical errors. Regarding claims 1, 5, 11, 19, 20, the limitation "share" has been amended to read "ratio". This term is supported by Specification Para [32], and further supported by the limitation of Claim 1 step (c): "allocating a predetermined ratio of a unit power supply". Additionally, regarding claim 5, the term "total share" has been amended to read "entire share", which is fully supported by Specification Para [32]. No new matter is added by these amendments. Consideration of all amendments is respectfully requested.

2. Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 – 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris in view of Ninomiya.

Response

Claim 1

The Examiner states that combining the prior arts of Norris and Ninomiya would result in the method disclosed by Claim 1. The applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 discloses a method wherein a portable device sets a time for a plurality of tasks, and a user can increase the time allocated to a task in an active window, by utilizing time

allocated to other tasks.

As disclosed in the specification, "In the embodiment, elements other than the CPU 15, the HDD 31, and the back light device 47 are supplied with fixed power. After summing up the fixed power amounts, the BIOS subtracts the sum of the fixed power amounts from the maximum power consumption, to obtain the amount of power to be supplied to each power-consumption-variable component (step 707). Thereafter, the BIOS sets the amount of power to be supplied to each power-consumption-variable component (col.9, lines 37-46)," Ninomiya teaches allocating the available power based on hardware components instead of software tasks. As disclosed in the specification, "the application programs 50 and 52 execute a set_ performance_state system call via the operating system 48 to request changes in the processor performance state by the performance manager 44. The set_ performance_state system call to the performance manager 44 specifies either a high performance state, a medium performance state, or low performance state for the processor 12 (col.4, lines 57-64)," Norris discloses a method of allocating different performance states to application programs (i.e. tasks). That is, Norris discloses a system where power consumption is changed according to requests from tasks, whereas Ninomiya discloses a system where power is allocated according to an input operation time and hardware components disposed therein. As the power management method of Norris teaches against the power management method of Ninomiya, the applicants assert that a combination of the teachings is unreasonable since there is no motivation and no reasonable expectation of success.

Additionally, Norris teaches setting the performance states using different clock speed settings. If different application programs correspond to the same performance state, the CPU is operated at the same clock speed, but the power consumption of the application programs varies due to the fact that the application programs have different instructions to be executed. As a result, changing the performance state associated with a task makes the power consumption per unit time increased/decreased but unpredictable.

In other words, the power management method of Norris can change the power consumption state, but is unable to precisely control the power allocated to the task. Since the power allocation per unit time cannot be controlled, Norris neither teaches nor suggests that these performance states are determined according to ratios of unit power supply. Therefore, Norris fails to teach allocating **a ratio of total power to each task**. Similarly, as stated above, Ninomiya teaches allocating the available power based on hardware components instead of software tasks. It is clear that Ninomiya also fails to teach allocating **a ratio of total power to each task**. As a result, the claimed feature "increasing a ratio of the unit power supply allocated to a task running in an active window according to commands entered through a graphical user interface" is neither taught nor suggested by Norris and Ninomiya.

In summary, the applicants believe that Claim 1 has been placed in condition for allowance. Consideration of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 - 3

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on Claim 1, and as the applicants believe Claim 1 should be found allowable for the reasons stated above, claims 2 and 3 should also be found allowable.

Claim 4

Ninomiya teaches utilizing a periodic correction procedure interval to determine how much power is utilized by each **hardware component** of the system: "it is desirable that the BIOS monitors the actual use rate of each power-consumption-variable component at regular intervals" [Col. 10, lines 45 – 47]. The present invention, however, teaches utilizing a periodic correction procedure to determine how much power is utilized by each **task**: "observing a utilization of the unit power supply allocated to each task when a periodic correction procedure is reached". Additionally, Claim 4 is dependent upon Claim

1, and should be allowed if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 5

As detailed in the arguments under Claim 1, neither Ninomiya nor Norris teaches allocating a ratio of total power to a specific task. Furthermore, Norris does not disclose a total power limitation, and only teaches allocating power task by task according to the performance states. Norris also fails to disclose transferring power originally allocated to tasks having a batch attribute to a task running in an active window. Additionally, Claim 5 is dependent upon Claim 1, and should be allowed if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Claims 6 – 8

Neither Norris nor Ninomiya discloses categorizing tasks according to the type of the input/output devices interacting with the tasks. Additionally, Claims 6 – 8 are dependent on Claim 1 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 9

Referring to Norris Fig. 3a-3b and Ninomiya Fig. 3a-3b, neither Norris nor Ninomiya discloses providing a slide bar on a user interface and utilizing the slide bar to control the power allocation for the task running in an active window. Additionally, Claim 9 is dependent on Claim 1 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is dependent on Claim 1 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 11

Claim 11 teaches "distributing a predetermined ratio of a unit power supply among

the tasks according to the category of each task" and "transferring a ratio of a unit power supply allocated to tasks having a batch attribute to a task running in an active window". As neither Ninomiya nor Norris teaches these limitations, the applicants believe Claim 11 overcomes the obviousness rejections according to aforementioned arguments detailed in the response to Claim 1.

Claims 12 – 13

Claims 12 and 13 are dependent on Claim 11 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 11 is found allowable.

Claims 14 – 18

The applicants assert that Claims 14 – 18 should be found allowable for those reasons detailed in the response to Claims 4 and 6 – 9.

Claim 19

Claim 19 is an apparatus claim including the limitations of independent method claim 1. According to the arguments detailed under the response to claim 1, the applicants assert that Claim 19 should also be found allowable.

Claim 20

As shown in Norris Fig.4, Norris teaches using a graphical user interface to increase the processor speed. However, referring to the arguments detailed in the response to Claim 1, Norris and Ninomiya both fail to teach allocating **a ratio of total power to each task**. Therefore, the claimed feature "a graphical user interface for the user to increase the ratio of the unit power supply allocated to the task running in the active window through the commands input by the user" is neither taught nor suggested by Norris and Ninomiya. Additionally, Claim 20 is dependent upon Claim 19, and should be allowed if Claim 19 is

found allowable.

Claim 21

Claim 21 is dependent on Claim 19 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 19 is found allowable.

Claim 22

The applicants assert that Claim 22 should be found allowable for those reasons detailed in the response to Claim 9.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu Date: 11/29/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)